

REMARKS

This response is in reply to the non-final Office Action dated September 16, 2009. After its entry, claims 1 and 6-27 are currently pending in this application and subject to examination. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Drawings Objection

The present application stands objected to on the ground that it does not contain one or more drawings that show all of the features (*i.e.*, layers) of the claimed organic electroluminescent devices. Applicants are finalizing the required drawings and will submit them shortly in a supplemental amendment.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 6-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0106006 A1 to Eriyama et al. (Eriyama) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,009,338 to D'Andrade et al. (D'Andrade). Claims 11, 14, and 16 stand rejected obvious over Eriyama in view of D'Andrade in further view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0096138 A1 to Lecloux et al. (Lecloux). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 6-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27

Claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, that the emission layer on the anode side be directly adjacent to an electrically conductive layer, wherein the electrically conductive layer is either (1) the anode or (1) an organic hole-injection layer comprising a doped conductive polymer or a doped triarylamine derivative. A hole-injection layer is defined in the present specification at page 4, lines 11-12, as, *inter alia*, "... an organic or organometallic layer ***which is in direct contact with the anode ...***" In other words, the at least one emission layer of claim 1 is either (1) directly adjacent to the anode or (2) directly adjacent to an organic hole-injection layer comprising a

doped conductive polymer or a doped triarylamine derivative, which is, in turn, directly adjacent to the anode.

In contrast, the organic electroluminescent device depicted in Figure 1 of Eriyama requires an intervening hole-transporting layer (3) between the anode (2) and the copper phthalocyanine layer (4), which the Examiner considers to be an organic hole-injection layer. As a result of this configuration, the copper phthalocyanine layer (4) is not directly adjacent to the anode (2). Therefore, the luminescent layer (5) of the organic electroluminescent device of Eriyama is neither (1) directly adjacent to an anode or (2) directly adjacent to an organic hole-injection layer that is directly adjacent to an anode, as required by claim 1. Moreover, neither Eriyama nor D'Andrade provide the skilled artisan with any suggestion or motivation to omit the hole-transporting layer (3) from the organic electroluminescent device of Eriyama such that the copper phthalocyanine layer (4) would be directly adjacent to the anode (2).

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP 2143.03, citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Since the combined disclosures of Eriyama and D'Andrade fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 cannot be rendered *prima facie* obvious over the combination of these references. Furthermore, since claims 6-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27 all ultimately depend from claim 1, these claims likewise cannot be rendered *prima facie* obvious over the combination of Eriyama and D'Andrade. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 11, 14, and 16

Applicants submit that the combined disclosures of Eriyama, D'Andrade, and Lecloux fail to render claims 11, 14, and 16 *prima facie* obvious for the same reasons provided *supra* regarding claims 1, 6-10, 12, 13, 15, and 17-27. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Response dated December 16, 2009

Reply to Non-Final Office Action dated September 16, 2009

Applicants believe no fee is due with this amendment. However, if a fee is due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14113-00010-US, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Eamonn P. Morrison/

Eamonn P. Morrison

Registration No.: 55,841

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P. O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207

(302) 658-9141

(302) 658-5614 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant